

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE D.S.R. VARMA

—

WRIT PETITION NO.24036 OF 1995

Between:

1. V.V. Ramana, S/o Satyanarayana, age: 29 years, R/o Bairi Singupuram village, Via Amudalavalasa, Srikakulam District and one another.

Petitioners

■ ■ ■

AND

The Regional Manager, APSRTC, Vizianagaram and one another.

....Respondent

—

—

—

—

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

-
-
-
-
HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE D.S.R.VARMA

-
WRIT PETITION NO.24036 OF 1995

ORAL ORDER:

Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners as well as the learned Standing Counsel appearing for Andhra Pradesh State Road Transport Corporation (for brevity "the Corporation").

2. The petitioners seek a declaration that the proceedings of the second respondent herein bearing No.P2/590(06)/88-DVM-SKLM, dated 18.3.1994, are illegal and arbitrary.

3. The whole grievance of the petitioners is that the petitioners, being displaced employees of earlier private bus, who were working as Conductor and Cleaner, respectively, were not absorbed in the Corporation. Some material also had been placed on record in order to show that they served the private bus. Despite which, after nationalization, their services were not regularized/absorbed in the Corporation.

4. Subsequently, it is a known factor that, by virtue of the interference of this Court, such of those employees, who approached this Court, were interviewed, verified various material in order to know whether they were the employees of private bus etc., considered the cases of some employees and rejected the cases of some employees and the cases of the petitioners belong to the latter.

5. In this regard, it is to be seen that the petitioners were terminated in the year 1987 owing to the nationalization of buses. So far, almost two decades have elapsed and their cases, as directed by this Court, were already rejected earlier. Further, it is stated by the learned Standing Counsel appearing for the Corporation that the bus on which the petitioners were allegedly working did not ply at all, as per the letter given by the Regional Transport Officer.

6. Therefore, having regard to the facts and circumstances, it is not feasible or expedient to consider the cases of the petitioners at this length of time.

7. For the foregoing, the writ petition fails and is liable to be dismissed.

8. Accordingly, the Writ Petition is dismissed. No order as to costs.

D.S.R.VARMA, J

Dated: 05.9.2006

KA